UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/529,792	09/27/2000	Aviv Refuah	092/00810(23	3705

67801 7590 06/09/2008

MARTIN D. MOYNIHAN d/b/a PRTSI, INC.
P.O. BOX 16446
ARLINGTON, VA 22215

EXAMINER
BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/529,792	REFUAH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DOUGLAS B. BLAIR	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 March 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *See Continuation Sheet* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,7-17,19, 20,92,93,95,96,100,104-111,113-120,123-125,128-134,136-138 and 160-163* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *18 and 101* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-3,7-20,92,93,95,96,100,101,104-111,113-120,123-125,128-134,136-138 and 160-163.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/2007 has been entered.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 14, and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities:

The term "content" is considered plural so it is unclear why the article "a" is placed in from of it. The same goes for the first use of "software" in claim 1. The Examiner suggests either removing the article in front of these terms or referring to an "individual piece of content" or an "individual piece of software" or similar language. Claims 14 and 16 are objected to for having similar problems.

Also the applicant uses the transition "which" to further limit the claims. The Examiner suggests replacing "which" with "wherein the" in situations where the applicant is trying to further limit previously mentioned elements in the claim. Claims 14 and 16 are objected to for having similar problems.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the browser of claim 18 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 95, 100, 101, 113-120, and 131-132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the information" in the final line of the claim. The claim previously refers to two types of information, that dealing with the query and the information entered by the database. It is unclear which "information" the applicant intends to refer to. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 3, 95, 100, 101, 113-120, and 131-132 have the same problem with "information" as claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 7-14, 19-20, 92, 104-111, 113-120, 123-125, 128-132 and 136 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,853,993 to Ortega et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,332,158 to Risley et al. in further view of the Google website from 1998 (Obtained from archive.org).

As to claim 1, Ortega teaches a method of WWW page retrieval from a web site, comprising: entering information associated with content of the site, wherein the information is

not a WWW address or a portion thereof, wherein the entering comprises typing by a user **(col. 4, lines 59-61)**; providing said information to software not associated with said site **(col. 4, lines 61-64, the query server is not associated with the site the user is trying to find with the search query)**; analyzing said information to correct spelling in said information, so as to provide a spelling-correct input **(col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 16)**; providing a page address of a page of said site, responsive to said spelling corrected input, by said software **(col. 2, lines 55-65, the query results are returned to the user)**; retrieving said page responsive to said page address **(col. 2, lines 55-65)**; wherein said page address is determined using a database of associations **(col. 2, lines 1-11)**; and wherein the database is stored at a location remote from where the search query was entered **(See Figure 1)**; however Ortega does not teach the database being logically associated with a particular user wherein said database includes information regarding a particular user that is entered by said user where a page is selected for display based on this information. Ortega also does not teach a method of displaying a page as a result of a search query using a browser without any additional user intervention beyond entering the query.

Risley teaches a method of WWW page retrieval comprising the database being logically associated with a particular user wherein said database includes information regarding a particular user that is entered by said user where a page is selected for display based on this information **(Abstract and col. 2, lines 16-26, the past domain name searches for a particular user read on this limitation)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Internet art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Ortega regarding a search engine that modifies

queries with the teachings of Risley regarding a database logically associated with a user for resolving queries because provides a user with more personalized results according to Risley.

Google taught a method of WWW page retrieval comprising displaying a page as a result of a search query using a browser without any additional user intervention beyond entering the query **(The Google "I'm Feeling Lucky" button provided this functionality)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Internet art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Ortega-Risley combination regarding the correction of search queries with the teachings of Google because providing a page automatically gets the page to the user quicker with less effort on the user's part.

As to claim 2, the information about past queries by users taught by Risley satisfies this limitation.

As to claim 3, the matching terms taught by Ortega satisfy this limitation.

As to claims 7-10 and 12, the collection of past queries taught by Risley satisfies these limitations.

As to claim 13, the stored matching terms of Ortega satisfy this limitation.

As to claim 14, It is rejected for the same reasoning as claim 1. Risley teaches user dependent information including user browsing habits.

As to claims 19-20, the search engine taught by Ortega is considered overlaying "location window".

As to claim 92, Ortega is directed towards automated web searches.

As to claim 104, the past queries taught by Risley are considered a popularity level.

As to claim 105, the correlation tables taught by Ortega satisfy this limitation.

As to claims 106-111, 113-120, 123-125, 128-132 and 136, they are all obvious in view of Ortega, Risly and Google.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,853,993 to Ortega et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,332,158 to Risley et al. in and the Google website from 1998 (Obtained from archive.org), in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,397,219 to Mills.

The combination of Ortega, Risly and Google combine to make obvious claim 14; however they do not explicitly teach providing based on geographic characteristics.

Mills teaches providing based on geographic characteristics (See the mapping provided in the rejection of claim 16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Internet art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Ortega, Risly, Google combination regarding search queries with the teachings of Mills regarding geographic queries because geographic queries provide a user with information that is potentially more relevant than information otherwise.

Claims 16-17, 93, 96, 138, and 161-163 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,397,219 to Mills in view of the Google website from 1998 (Obtained from archive.org).

As to claim 16, Mills teaches a method of WWW page retrieval from a web site, comprising: entering information associated with content of the site, wherein the information is not a WWW address or a portion thereof, wherein the entering comprises typing by a user **(col. 14, lines 14-43)**; providing said information to software not associated with said site; determining a geographical location of the user **(col. 14, lines 14-43)**; providing a page address

of a page of said site, responsive to said entered information and said determined geographical location, by said software **(col. 14, lines 14-43)**; retrieving said page responsive to said page address and displaying said page **(col. 14, lines 14-43)**; However Mills does not explicitly teach a method of displaying a page as a result of a search query using a browser without any additional user intervention beyond entering the query.

Google taught a method of WWW page retrieval comprising displaying a page as a result of a search query using a browser without any additional user intervention beyond entering the query **(The Google "I'm Feeling Lucky" button provided this functionality)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Internet art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Mills regarding the providing geographic results for search queries with the teachings of Google because providing a page automatically gets the page to the user quicker with less effort on the user's part.

As to claim 17, Mills teaches this limitation because a search query is considered to be entered the same way a URL would be entered.

As to claim 93, Mills is directed towards automated web searches.

As to claim 96, the information entered into the search engine is English. English is somewhat Latin based but is considered "non-Latin" because it is not Latin.

As to claims 138 and 160-163, the cited portion of Mills teaches these features.

Claim 133-134 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,853,993 to Ortega et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,332,158 to Risley et al. in and the Google website from 1998 (Obtained from archive.org), in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0184534 to Rangan et al.

The combination of Ortega, Risly and Google combine to make obvious claim 1; however they do not explicitly teach providing based on geographic characteristics.

Rangan teaches the limitation of claims 133 and 134 (see paragraph 35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Internet art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Ortega, Risly, Google combination regarding search queries with the teachings of Rangan regarding the storage of passwords because storing passwords for sites allows for more convenient access to the sites.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 18, 101 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 100 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS B. BLAIR whose telephone number is (571)272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Douglas B Blair/
Examiner, Art Unit 2142